

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Projecting non-native Douglas fir plantations in Southern Europe with the Forest Vegetation Simulator

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1614159> since 2018-03-27T13:10:11Z

Published version:

DOI:10.5849/forsci.16-048

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Projecting non-native Douglas fir plantations in Southern Europe with the Forest Vegetation**
2 **Simulator**

4 **Abstract**

5 In Italy, Douglas fir has a high potential in terms of wood production and drought tolerance.
6 However, a growth reference for mature stands is lacking. We calibrated and validated the Pacific
7 Northwest variant of FVS to Douglas fir plantations, and ran the calibrated model to test
8 management alternatives. We calibrated the height-diameter, crown width, crown ratio, and
9 diameter increment submodels of FVS using multipliers fitted against tree measurements (n =704)
10 and increment cores (180) from 20 plots. Validation was carried out on tree-level variables sampled
11 in 1996 and 2015 in two independent permanent plots (275 trees). Multiplier calibration improved
12 the error of crown submodels by 7-19%; self-calibration of the diameter growth submodel produced
13 scale factors of 1.0 – 5.2 for each site. Validation of 20-years simulations was more satisfactory for
14 tree diameter (-6% to +1% mean percent error) than for height (-10% – +8%). Calibration reduced
15 the error of predicted basal area and yield after 50 years relative to yield tables. Simulated response
16 to thinning diverged depending on site index and competition intensity. FVS is a viable option to
17 model the yield of Douglas fir plantations in Italy, reflecting current understanding of forest
18 ecosystem dynamics and how they respond to management interventions.

21 Keywords: Empirical forest models; growth and yield; calibration; plantation management;
22 *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Mirb.) Franco

23 1 Introduction

24

25 Plantations are a resource with global importance for wood and pulp production (Forest Europe
26 2015). In Europe, Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Mirb.) Franco) has been planted on a large
27 scale and is now the most economically important exotic tree species (Schmid et al. 2014; Ducci
28 2015). Douglas fir has usually a high growth rate in comparison with other forest tree species in
29 Europe, has a higher resistance to drought (Eilmann and Rigling 2012), and may provide high
30 added-value timber (especially after the first thinning) (Monty et al. 2008). In Southern Europe, no
31 indigenous conifer has similar characteristics of productivity and timber quality (Corona et al.
32 1998).

33 In Italy, Douglas fir was introduced in 1882 (Pucci 1882) using seeds from the Pacific Northwest
34 Coast of the United States (Pavari and De Philippis 1941). Between 1922 and 1938, the “Stazione
35 Sperimentale di Selvicoltura” established 98 experimental plantations (Pavari 1916; Pavari and De
36 Philippis 1941; Nocentini 2010). These trials demonstrated that a variety of sites in central and
37 northern Italy was suitable for the species (Pavari 1958). Nowadays, Douglas fir plantations cover
38 an area of about 0,8 million ha in Europe (Forest Europe 2015). In Tuscany (Central Italy), Douglas
39 fir covers 3,360 hectares in pure stands and 2,112 hectares in mixed stands (Regional Forest
40 Inventory of Tuscany 1998).

41 The key to successful management of productive Douglas fir plantations is a proper understanding
42 of growth dynamics in relation to tree characteristics, stand structure, and environmental variables.
43 The productivity of Douglas fir stands in Italy was studied by Pavari and De Philippis (1941) and,
44 distinctly, by Cantiani (1965) who established a yield table for stands up to 50 years old, based on
45 115 plots of different ages.

46 Growth and yield models simulate forest dynamics through time (i.e., growth, mortality,
47 regeneration). They are widely used in forest management because of their ability to support the
48 updating of inventories, predict future yield, and support the assessment of management alternatives

49 and silvicultural options, thus providing information for decision-making (Vanclay 1994). Much
50 research has been carried out to model the growth of Douglas fir throughout its home range
51 (Newnham and Smith 1964; Arney 1972; Mitchell 1975; Curtis et al. 1981; Wykoff et al. 1982;
52 Wykoff 1986; Ottorini 1991; Wimberly and Bare 1996; Hann and Hanus 2002; Hann et al. 2003).
53 In Italy, a growth reference for Douglas fir stands older than 50 years is currently lacking. Here, we
54 propose the use of Forest Vegetation Simulator (FVS) to simulate the growth of such stands.
55 FVS is an empirical, individual tree, distance-independent growth and yield model originally
56 developed in the Inland Empire area of Idaho and Montana (Stage 1973). FVS can simulate many
57 forest types and stand structures ranging from even-aged to uneven-aged, and single to mixed
58 species in single to multi-story canopies. There are more than 20 geographical variants of FVS,
59 each with its own parameterization of tree growth and mortality equations for a particular
60 geographic area of the United States. In addition, FVS incorporates extensions that can simulate
61 pest and disease impacts, fire effects, fuel loading and regeneration (Crookston 2005).
62 FVS has been rarely used in Italy (Vacchiano et al. 2014). The aims of this work are: (1) calibrating
63 and validating the Pacific Northwest Coast variant of FVS to Douglas fir plantations in Italy, (2)
64 comparing predictions from the calibrated model against available yield tables for Douglas fir in
65 Italy, and (3) using the calibrated model to test silvicultural alternatives for Douglas fir plantation
66 management.

67

68 2 Materials

69

70 Data for this work were measured in 20 stands of Douglas fir planted between 1927 and 1942 over a
71 2000 km² wide area in the northern Apennines, mostly within and nearby Tuscany region (Figure
72 1), at elevations ranging between 770 and 1260 m a.s.l. For each stand, Table 1 reports climatic data
73 derived from ClimateEU (Hamann et al. 2013) and Ecopedological Units (EU) from the

74 Ecopedological Map of Italy (Costantini et al. 2012). For each stand Table 2 reports aspect, slope,
75 and site index, i.e. the top height at 50 years assessed according to Maetzke and Nocentini (1994).

76
77 Tree measurements were carried out in a 20-m radius circular plot located at the center of each
78 sampled stand, except Pietracamela that had a radius of 10 m. For each living tree (for a total of 704
79 trees) we measured: stem diameter at 130 cm height (DBH), total height (HT), crown length (CL),
80 and crown width (CW) as the average of two orthogonal crown diameters. From a sub-sample of 8-
81 10 trees per plot, we extracted an increment core at 130 cm above the ground. Tree cores were
82 prepared for measurement in the lab and analyzed with LINTAB and TSAP-WIN software; from
83 each core (for a total of 180 cores) we measured the radial increment from the last 10 annual rings
84 to the nearest 0.01 mm.

85
86 3 Calibration

87
88 In order to adjust FVS to local growing conditions, the model components (hereafter “submodels”)
89 need to undergo calibration against observed data. FVS submodels include height-diameter
90 equations, crown width equations, crown ratio equations, tree diameter growth equations, tree
91 height growth equations, mortality equations, and bark ratio equations. Due to the lack of repeated
92 field measurements, this paper focuses on the first four submodels, leaving the others unchanged.
93 Since the considered populations of Douglas fir come from the Pacific Northwest coast of the
94 United States (Pavari and De Philippis 1941), the Pacific Northwest (PN) variant of FVS (Keyser
95 2014) was used as a basis for model calibration and runs. The original range considered by this
96 variant covers from a line between Coos Bay and Roseburg, Oregon in the south to the northern
97 shore of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington, and from the Pacific coast to the eastern slope of the
98 Coast Range and Olympic Mountains (Keyser 2014).

99 FVS includes two options to calibrate model performance to local growing conditions (Dixon
100 2002): (i) automatic scaling by the model, and (ii) user-defined multipliers of model output entered
101 by the user by specific input scripts or “keywords” (Van Dyck and Smith-Mateja 2000). For the
102 height-diameter and large tree diameter growth submodels we analyzed the performance of
103 automatic calibration, while for crown width and crown ratio submodels we fitted user-defined
104 multipliers. The following paragraphs illustrate, for each of the four submodels, the adopted
105 calibration strategy and its results.

106 All the variables in the FVS equations are expressed in imperial units; conversion to and from the
107 metric system was carried out outside the calibration algorithms. The simulation cycle is 10 years.

108 To check whether each submodel needed calibration, we fitted FVS submodels to the observed data
109 and computed 95% confidence intervals for all regression coefficients. If default FVS coefficients
110 were outside of locally-calibrated confidence intervals, model adjustment was deemed necessary.
111 Additionally, we compared the fit of non-calibrated versus calibrated submodels against observed
112 data, using coefficient of determination (R^2), root mean square error (RMSE), mean bias (MBE),
113 mean absolute bias (MABE) and mean percent bias (MPE) as goodness-of-fit metrics (Rehman
114 1999).

115

116 3.1 Height-Diameter submodel

117

118 Height-Diameter relationships in FVS are used to estimate missing tree heights in the input data. By
119 default, the PN variant uses the Curtis-Arney functional form as shown in Equation [1] (Arney 1985;
120 Curtis 1967). Height-Diameter submodel (HT) uses an internal self-calibration method; if users
121 don’t provide all stem heights, but more than three, the height-diameter equation is calibrated.

122

$$123 \quad HT = 4.5 + p2 * \exp(-p3 * DBH^{p4}) \quad [1]$$

124

125 where p_2 - p_4 are species-specific parameters (default values for the PN variant: $p_2=407.1595$;
126 $p_3=7.2885$; $p_4=-0.5908$).

127 When fitted against observed tree heights from all the plots here considered, Equation (1) had two
128 parameters whose confidence intervals did not include the FVS default values (Table 3): submodel
129 adjustment was therefore needed.

130

131 The fit of the uncalibrated submodel against observations (Figure 2) produced a R^2 of 0.6 and MPE
132 equal to 1.18%, corresponding to MBE equal to 33 cm and RMSE of 4.86 m. The new coefficients
133 (p_2 - p_4) were calculated by nonlinear regression: $p_2 = 199.4300348$, $p_3 = 8.9860045$, $p_4 = -0.9680623$.

134 The calibrated HT submodel produced an MBE equal to -0.3 cm and an RMSE of 4.16 m.

135

136 3.2 Crown width submodel

137

138 In PN-FVS, crown width (CW) is computed as a function of tree and stand characteristics (Equation
139 2: Crookston 2005) and bound to ≤ 24 m:

140

$$CW = (a_1 * BF) * DBH^{a_2} * HT^{a_3} * CL^{a_4} * (BA + 1.0)^{a_5} * (\exp(EL))^{a_6} \quad []$$

141

142 where BF is a species- and location-based coefficient (default BF for Douglas fir= 0.977), BA is
143 stand basal area, EL is stand elevation in hundreds of feet, and a_1 – a_6 are species-specific
144 parameters ($a_1=6.02270$; $a_2= 0.54361$; $a_3= -0.20669$; $a_4= 0.20395$; $a_5=-0.00644$; $a_6=-0.00378$). When
145 Equation [2] was fitted against observed data, only two parameters were inside the 95% confidence
146 intervals of the uncalibrated equation (Table 3): submodel adjustment was therefore needed.

147 To this end, we used the CWEQN keyword that allows to enter user-defined coefficients for a new
148 species-specific crown width model (Equation 3):

149

$$CW = s_0 + (s_1 * DBH) + (s_2 * DBH^{s_3}) [3]$$

150

151 where the coefficients $s_0 - s_3$ were determined by nonlinear regression: $s_0=6.701$, $s_1=0$, $s_2=0.111$,
 152 $s_3=1.502$. Calibration improved model fit: MPE decreased from 31% to 12%, MBE from 83 cm to
 153 0.2 cm and RMSE from 2.12 m to 1.87 m.

154

155 3.3 Crown ratio submodel

156

157 Crown ratio (CR), i.e. the ratio of crown length to total tree height, is a commonly used predictor of
 158 diameter increment both in United States (Wykoff 1990) and Europe (Monserud and Sterba 1996).
 159 It is an indicator of the joint effects of stand density, tree size and vigor, and social position of each
 160 tree in the stand. Crown ratio equations are used for three purposes by FVS: (i) to estimate tree
 161 crown ratios missing from the input data for both live and dead trees; (ii) to estimate change in
 162 crown ratio for each simulated cycle for live trees; and (iii) to estimate initial crown ratios for
 163 regenerating trees established during a simulation (Keyser 2014).

164

165 PN-FVS uses a Weibull-based model to predict crown ratio for all live trees with $DBH > 2.5$ cm
 166 (Dixon 1985). First, the average stand crown ratio (ACR) on a 1-100 scale is estimated as a function
 167 of stand density (Equation 4: Johnson and Kotz 1995):

168

$$ACR = d_0 + d_1 * RELSDI * 100 [4]$$

169

170 where $d_0 - d_1$ are species-specific coefficients ($d_0=5.666442$; $d_1=-0.025199$) and $RELSDI$ = relative
 171 Stand Density Index, i.e., the ratio between measured (SDI) and species-specific maximum SDI
 172 (SDI_{max}). SDI is a measure of relative density based on the self-thinning rule (Yoda et al. 1963)
 173 i.e., the inverse relationship between the number of plants per unit of area and the mean size of the

174 individuals (Comeau et al. 2010; Pretzsch and Biber 2005; Shaw 2006; Vacchiano et al. 2005). SDI
 175 (Reineke 1933) is calculated according to Equation (5):

176

$$177 \quad SDI = TPA \left(\frac{Qmd}{25} \right)^{1.605} [5]$$

178

179 where TPA is the number of trees per acre. Maximum SDI is provided as species-specific default
 180 (SDImax for Douglas fir = 950). Maximum SDI also controls FVS mortality equations; by default,
 181 density related mortality begins at RELSDI =55% (Dixon 1986).

182

183 ACR is then used to estimate the parameters A, B, and C of the Weibull distribution of individual
 184 CRs (Equations 6-10):

$$185 \quad A = A0 [6]$$

$$B = B0 + B1 * ACR \text{ (bound to } B > 3) [7]$$

$$C = C0 + C1 * ACR \text{ (bound to } C > 2) [8]$$

$$SCALE = 1 - (0.00167 + (CCF - 100)) [9]$$

$$CR = A + B * \left(\left(-\log \left(1 - \left(SCALE * \frac{RANK}{N} \right) \right) \right)^{1/c} \right) [10]$$

186

187 where a_0 , $b_0 - b_1$, $c_0 - c_1$ are species-specific coefficients (Keyser 2014) ($a_0=0$; $b_0=-0.012061$;
 188 $b_1=1.119712$; $c_0=3.2126$; $c_1=0$), N is the number of trees in the stand, RANK is a tree's rank in the
 189 stand DBH distribution (1 = the smallest; N = the largest), SCALE is a density-dependent scaling
 190 factor (Siipilehto et al. 2007) bound to $0.3 < SCALE < 1.0$, and CCF is stand crown competition
 191 factor (Krajicek et al. 1961), computed as the summation of individual CCF (CCF_t) from trees with
 192 DBH > 2.5 cm (Equation 11: Paine and Hann 1982).

193

$$CCFt = r1 + (r2 * DBH) + (r3 * DBH^2) [11]$$

194

195 where $r_1 - r_3$ are species-specific coefficients ($r_1=0.0387616$; $r_2=0.0268821$; $r_3=0.00466086$).

196

197 When fitted against observed data, confidence interval of Equation [10] included the PN-FVS
198 default values only in one case (Table 3), therefore calibration was needed.

199 The fit of the uncalibrated crown ratio model against observed data was very poor ($R^2 = 0.08$, MPE
200 = 14%, MBE = -2.64 m, RSME = 4.47 m).

201 Crown ratio calibration was attained by a keyword (CRNMULT) that multiplies simulated crown
202 ratios by a specified proportion (Hamilton 1994). The value of CRNMULT (=1.22) was determined
203 by nonlinear regression using observed CR as dependent variable and the independent variables
204 from Equations [4]-[10].

205 CRNMULT improved the fit of the CR submodel: R^2 from 0.08 to 0.91, MPE from -14.02% to
206 5.13%, MBE from -2.64 to -0.49 m and RMSE from 4.47 to 3.89 m.

207

208 3.4 Large Tree Diameter Growth submodel

209

210 The large ($DBH > 7.62$ cm) tree diameter growth model used in most FVS variants predicts the
211 natural logarithm of the periodic change in squared inside-bark diameter ($\ln(DDS)$) (Equation 12:
212 Stage 1973) as a function of tree, stand and site characteristics:

213

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln(DDS) = & b1 + (b2 * EL) + (b3 * EL^2) + (b4 * \ln(SI)) + (b5 * \sin(ASP) * SL) \\
& + (b6 * \cos(ASP) * SL) + (b7 * SL) + (b8 * SL^2) + (b9 * \ln(DBH)) \\
& + (b10 * CR) + (b11 * CR^2) + (b12 * DBH^2) + \left(b13 * \frac{BAL}{\ln(DBH + 1.0)} \right) \\
& + (b14 * CCF) + (b15 * RELHT) + (b16 * \ln(BA)) + (b17 * BAL) \\
& + (b18 * BA) [12]
\end{aligned}$$

214

215 where BAL is total basal area in trees larger than the subject tree, RELHT is tree height divided by
216 the average height of the 40 largest diameter trees in the stand, b1 is a location-specific coefficient
217 that defaults to -0.1992, and b2-b18 are species-specific coefficients (b₂=-0.009845; b₃=0;
218 b₄=0.495162; b₅=0.003263; b₆=0.014165; b₇=-0.340401; b₈=0; b₉=0.802905; b₁₀=1.936912; b₁₁=0;
219 b₁₂=-0.0000641; b₁₃=-0.001827; b₁₄=0; b₁₅=0; b₁₆=-0.129474; b₁₇=-0.001689; b₁₈=0) (Keyser
220 2014).

221 When fitted against the observations, confidence interval analysis showed that only two parameters
222 of Equation [12] were inside the 95% confidence intervals of the uncalibrated equation (Table 3),
223 therefore the model needed calibration. This was attained by enabling self-adjustment of growth
224 predictions by scale factor calculation.

225 When five or more observations of periodic increment for a species are provided for a plot, FVS can
226 adjust the increment models to reflect local conditions (Stage 1981). This automatic calibration
227 computes a species-specific scale factor that is used as a multiplier to the base growth equations,
228 bound to a range of 0.08-12.18, and applied at the plot level. The scale factors are attenuated over
229 time. The attenuation is asymptotic to one-half the difference between the initial scale factor value
230 and one. The rate of attenuation is dependent only on time, and has a half-life of 25 year (Dixon
231 2002).

232 In order to check for bias, we disabled the self-calibration and randomization algorithms of the large
233 tree diameter growth model using the NOCALIB and NOTRIPLE keywords, and scrutinized scale
234 factors for $\ln(DDS)$ automatically calculated against observed periodic increments.
235 These scale factors ranged from 1 to over 5, showing a large variety of growing conditions
236 unaccounted for by the default growth equation (Table 4). The high heterogeneity of growth is also
237 shown by the ratio of the standard deviation of the residuals for the growth sample to the model
238 standard error, which is consistently higher than 1.0. Bayes weights (Krutchkoff 1972) are an
239 expression of confidence that the growth sample represents a different population than does the
240 original data used to fit the model (in this case, PN-FVS data). In other words, a value of 0.90
241 would indicate a 90% certainty that the growth sample represents a different population than the
242 database used to fit the model (Dixon 2002).

243

244 4 Model validation

245

246 We used independent datasets from two of the oldest permanent plots in Italy (Mercurella: 85 years,
247 39,336°N, 16,081°E; Vallombrosa: 90 years, 43,749°N, 11,577°E) to validate the calibrated PN-
248 FVS for a total of 275 trees. Using the the TIMEINT keyword, we ran a simulation from 1996 to
249 2015 with a cycle length of 5 years. We compared predicted vs. observed DBH and height
250 (Mercurella: year 2012, Vallombrosa: year 2015). Initial stem heights in Mercurella (1996) were
251 calculated with Curtis-Arney function (Curtis 1967). The value of R^2 between predicted and
252 observed data for DBH was high in both sites (Table 5), especially for Vallombrosa (0.96), while R^2
253 for height was lower (0.54 in Mercurella and 0.72 in Vallombrosa).

254

255 5 Comparison with yield tables

256

257 We ran the locally-calibrated PN variant of FVS 50 years into the future using site characteristics
 258 referred to the measured 20 plots and starting from bare ground. Initial plantation density was set at
 259 2745 trees per hectare, i.e. similar to the initial density of the yield table by Cantiani (1965), using
 260 the PLANT keyword. We instructed FVS to reproduce the same treatments prescribed by the
 261 Cantiani yield table, by using the THINBTA keyword (Thinning from below to trees per acre
 262 target); thinnings were scheduled after 20 years (20% basal area removal), 30 years (30% removal),
 263 40 years (25% removal), and 50 years (25% removal). We compared basal area simulated by the
 264 uncalibrated and calibrated PN-FVS (mean across all stands) against the Cantiani yield table.
 265 In all stands, simulated basal area was higher than the one predicted by the yield table with a MBE
 266 $9.23 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$, RMSE $13.05 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$, and MPE 26%.
 267 Calibration reduced the difference between the Cantiani yield table established for Douglas fir
 268 plantations in Tuscany and simulated mean basal area (Figure 3) and volume (Figure 4) across all
 269 stands.
 270
 271 6 Model runs and management options
 272
 273 Finally, in order to evaluate management alternatives for mature Douglas fir plantations in Italy, we
 274 used the calibrated PN-FVS to simulate the results of thinning in two plots with comparable site
 275 index but different competition intensity. SDI controls FVS mortality model, and density related
 276 mortality begins when the stand SDI is above 55% of SDImax (Dixon 1986). We chose plots
 277 Acquerino58 (relative SDI 60.94%, Site index 31m) and Campamoli (relative SDI 48.15%, Site
 278 index 37 m) as test sites with similar fertility but different competition intensity. Data from both
 279 stands were run for 50 years into the future, starting from year 2013, and prescribing a thinning
 280 from below at the beginning of the simulation using the THINBTA keyword with three different
 281 management choices (type A 10%, type B 30%, type C control = no thinning).

Simulation results diverged depending on site index and current competition intensity. For all thinning regimes, both basal area and volume increased linearly in the low-competition stand (Campamoli: relative SDI =48%). In the high competition stand (Acquerino58: relative SDI = 60%) basal area decreased under the no thinning and 10% thinning regimes because of high competition mortality (Figure 5).

7 Discussion

FVS can be calibrated by self-calibration (e.g., the height-diameter and large tree diameter growth) or growth multipliers (e.g., crown width and crown ratio submodels). These multipliers allow the user to simulate growth patterns outside the region of first model calibration, i.e., in the presence of growth bias for any given species, geographic area, site, or forest type (Dixon 2002).

Height-Diameter self-calibration reduced from of 0.328 to -0.003 m, indicating that the functional form of this allometric equation is adequate to represent dimensional relationships of Douglas fir outside of its native range. A slightly different approach was followed to calibrate the crown width submodel, i.e., fitting a simplified equation with a different functional form. The analysis of maximum CW by Paine and Hann (1982) shows crowns larger than observed in Italy, probably because of the different thinning regimes and growing conditions in the two countries. Nevertheless, the new equation of crown width (Equation [3]) reduced MBE by 80 cm and MPE by 20 %, showing a satisfactory adjustment for this submodel.

Crown ratio is generally the second most important predictor of tree growth, after DBH. The uncalibrated CR submodel underestimated crown ratio in our plots. Observed crowns were 22% deeper than those predicted by default PN-FVS, possibly as a result of different forest management in these plots than in geographic range of origin (e.g., more intense thinning), altered competitive relationships (no inter-specific competitors in plantations), or improved growing conditions and soil fertility (site index in the upper part of the range provided by, e.g., McArdle et al. 1949). After

308 calibration, the CR submodel improved considerably, although MBE remained negative: (-2.64 m
309 default and -0.49 m calibrated).

310 Tree diameter growth or basal area growth equations have traditionally been used as one of the
311 primary types of growth equations for individual tree growth models (Holdaway 1984; Ritchie and
312 Hann 1985; Wykoff 1986; Wensel et al. 1987; Dolph 1988). A variety of equation forms and
313 covariates have been used in diameter increment models. Wykoff (1990) indicated that three types
314 of covariates need to be considered in a diameter increment model: tree size, competition and site.
315 FVS includes them all: tree (DBH, height), stand (crown competition factor, basal area, basal area
316 in larger tree) and site (aspect, slope, elevation, site index) characteristics are incorporated in a
317 single equation (Equation [12]). Self-calibration of the large-tree diameter increment model occurs
318 if, for a given species, there are at least five large (DBH >7.62 cm) tree records with measured
319 diameter increments. Correction scale factors relating measured to predicted increment are then
320 added to the simulations as multipliers. Scale factors higher than one, like the one computed by this
321 calibration study, imply that the default model is underpredicting diameter growth. The amount of
322 underprediction was major (up to 5-fold), but we could find no apparent relationship between scale
323 factor and topographic or site variables in our sample plots. Actual growth performance might be
324 related to unknown provenance differences, local soil water deficit (Sergent et al. 2014a), or soil
325 nitrogen content, which was found important in tree growth recovery after drought spells (Sergent
326 et al. 2014b). Previous calibrations of the FVS empirical diameter growth submodels found the a
327 18-parameter functional form too complicated to calibrate reliably and to discern ecological effects
328 of individual predictors, suggesting replacement by much simpler model forms (Shaw et al. 2006)
329 following sensitivity analysis of the most influential parameters (Vacchiano et al. 2008).

330 In this study it was not possible to calibrate other dynamic submodels of FVS, namely the height
331 increment and mortality components, due to the lack of repeated measures as a calibration dataset.
332 We acknowledge that mortality is an especially important component, as FVS has been previously
333 found to be highly sensitive to small differences in the self-thinning algorithm (De Rose et al.

2008). More research and monitoring are needed to understand both density-dependent and density-independent mortality in the non-native range of Douglas fir, especially regarding tree susceptibility to drought stress (Ruiz Diaz Britez et al. 2014) or extreme weather events.

The validation against independent data from Mercurella and Vallombrosa stands showed that the DBH was predicted with a higher accuracy than height, probably due to the lack of measured heights and, consequently, the absence of height-diameter self-calibration for Mercurella in the initial simulation year (1996), and possibly to the lack of calibration of the height growth submodel. The validation against these independent dataset showed that the calibrated model generally had a much lower prediction error than the original PN-FVS models, in particular for predicting DBH at Vallombrosa.

Even after calibration, PN-FVS overpredicted stand basal area at 50 years by 26% to a local yield table (Cantiani 1965). With only one direct measurement in time, it is impossible to ascertain whether this might be related to differences in species-specific carrying capacity (maximum SDI), or altered growing conditions as a consequence of e.g., climate change and/or higher nitrogen deposition relative to when the original yield table was fitted. However, biological validation of model behavior was successful, as simulated stands responded to different thinning (type A 10%, type B 30%) in a manner that was highly sensitive to their current site index and competition intensity. Where competition was higher, the benefit of thinning was greater.

In this work, our goal was to illustrate a model calibration procedure that could be replicated by forest managers starting from one-time tree size measurements compounded by an increment sampling. Calibration by multipliers is rigid in the sense that it does not allow for changing or simplifying model forms, e.g., dropping unused predictors or altering the shape of allometric curves (e.g., Russell et al. 2013), which could be attained only by rewriting the simulator code. However, our work was successful in providing a statistically validated decision support tool to project growth and yield of mature non-native Douglas fir plantations some decades into the future. Notwithstanding the inherent limitation of an empirical approach to forest modeling (Pretzsch

2009), the wealth of management options, model extensions, open access, and continuity of support by the developers make FVS an attractive option to managers and forest owners wishing to implement their management plans with scientifically based decision support tools.

8 Conclusion

This work has calibrated an age-independent, individual-tree, distance-independent growth and yield simulator for Douglas fir for Central Italy. A tree level simulator could be an effective tool for planning forest management. Calibrating this model to other areas and for other species in Italian forests may be a useful management support instead of traditional yield tables.

Other FVS submodels and extensions can be calibrated besides those here considered (Russell et al. 2015): regeneration, climate-FVS and especially mortality, which is an important growth submodel to be considered in future evaluations because it is one most sensitive to changes in future climate regimes, such as increases in drought severity and duration (Crookston et al. 2010). Simple modifications to the tree mortality model within PN-FVS could result in improved precision for estimating future number of trees (e.g., Radtke et al. 2012).

The self-calibration feature of FVS extends the geographic range over which the model can be exploited, assuming that the factors affecting growth in a given area also affect growth in the same way elsewhere. If this assumption cannot be accepted, the only other option is to refit the relationships using data from the geographic area of interest. If this procedure can be accepted, then the model equations can be calibrated rather easily.

Here, we have proved a relevant improvement for the application of FVS in Italy over the original model. The results also highlight the importance of using long-term historical growth data for the calibration and validation of the model. Permanent plots are generally well suited for tracking long-term model reliability and for evaluating model performance relative to specific treatments distinctively. Maintaining existing local networks of permanent plots, especially those with long

386 histories of measurement, to predict forest growth in the climate change, is suggested (Crookston et
387 al. 2010).

388 In conclusion, FVS has been proven to be a suitable type of yield modeling for Douglas fir forest
389 growth in Italy: (i) it suitably represents current understanding of the dynamic forest ecosystem and
390 how it responds over time to management interventions; (ii) it provides a monitoring target to test
391 our assumptions with (for example, stand yield following different silvicultural treatments and
392 successional pathways when no treatments are applied); (iii) it provides a modeling framework to
393 integrate existing modeling components such as crown equations, site index curves and ecological
394 land classification; (iv) it provides tools to develop and compare various silvicultural treatments; (v)
395 it simulates a stand through time to inform and instruct forest managers; (vi) it can be effectively
396 adopted to update inventory data.

397 References

- 398 Arney, J.D. 1972. *Computer simulation of Douglas-fir tree and stand growth*. Ph.D. Thesis, Oregon
399 State University, Corvallis, OR. 79 p.
- 400 Arney, J.D. 1985. A modeling strategy for the growth projection of managed stands. *Canadian*
401 *Journal of Forest Research* 15:511–518.
- 402 Cantiani, M. 1965. Tavola alsometrica della *Pseudotsuga douglasii* in Toscana. *Ricerche*
403 *sperimentali di dendrometria e auxometria dell'Istituto per l'Assestamento Forestale*
404 *dell'Università di Firenze* 4:32-73.
- 405 Comeau, P. G., M. White, G. Kerr, and S.E. Hale. 2010. Maximum density-size relationships for
406 Sitka spruce and coastal Douglas-fir in Britain and Canada. *Forestry* 83(5) :461–468.
- 407 Corona, P., R. Scotti, and N. Tarchiani. 1998. Relationship between environmental factors and site
408 index in Douglas-fir plantations in central Italy. *Forest Ecology and Management* 110(1-
409 3):195–207.

410 Costantini, E.A.C., G. L'Abate, R. Barbetti, M. Fantappiè, R. Lorenzetti, and S. Magini. 2012.
 411 Soil map of Italy, scale 1:1.000.000. SELCA, Firenze.

412 Crookston, N.L. 2005. Allometric crown width equations for 34 Northwest United States tree
 413 species estimated using generalized linear mixed effects models. Manuscript on file with the
 414 author at: US Forest Service, 1221 South Main St, Moscow ID, email: ncrookston@fs.fed.us

415 Crookston, N.L., G.E. Rehfeldt, G.E. Dixon, and A.R. Weiskittel. 2010. Addressing climate change
 416 in the forest vegetation simulator to assess impacts on landscape forest dynamics. *Forest*
 417 *Ecology and Management* 260:1198-1211.

418 Curtis, R.O. 1967. Height-diameter and height-diameter-age equations for second-growth Douglas-
 419 Fir. *Forest Science* 13 :365–375.

420 Curtis, R.O., G.W. Clendenen, and D.J. DeMars. 1981. A new stand simulator for coast Douglas-
 421 fir: DFSIM user's guide. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-128.

422 DeRose R.J., J.D. Shaw G. Vacchiano, and J.N. Long. 2008. Improving longleaf pine mortality
 423 predictions in the Southern Variant of the Forest Vegetation Simulator. P. 160-166 in
 424 *Proceedings of the Third Forest Vegetation Simulator Conference; Fort Collins, February 13–*
 425 *15, 2007*, Havis R.N., and N.L. Crookston (eds.). USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO.

426 Dixon, G.E. 1985. Crown ratio modeling using stand density index and the Weibull distribution.
 427 USDA For. Serv. Int. Rep.

428 Dixon, G.E. 1986. Prognosis mortality modeling. USDA For. Serv. Int. Rep.

429 Dixon, G.E. 2002. Essential FVS: A User's Guide. USDA For. Serv. Int. Rep.

430 Dolph, K.L. 1988. Site index curves for young-growth California white fir on the western slopes of
 431 the Sierra Nevada. USDA For. Serv. Res. Pap. PSW-RP-185.

432 Ducci, F. 2015. Genetic resources and forestry in the Mediterranean region in relation to global
 433 change. *Annals of Silvicultural Research* 39(2) :70–93.

434 Eilmann, B., and A. Rigling. 2012. Tree-growth analyses to estimate tree species' drought
 435 tolerance. *Tree Physiology* 32(2):178-187.

436 Forest Europe 2015. *State of Europe's Forests 2015*. Madrid, Ministerial Conference on the
 437 Protection of Forests in Europe, Spain.

438 Hamann, A., T. Wang, D.L. Spittlehouse, and T.Q. Murdock. 2013. A comprehensive, high-
 439 resolution database of historical and projected climate surfaces for western North America.
 440 *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 94:1307–1309

441 Hamilton, D.A. 1994. Uses and abuses of multipliers in the Stand Prognosis Model. USDA For.
 442 Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-GTR-310.

443 Hann, D.W., and M.L. Hanus. 2002. Enhanced height-growth-rate for undamaged and damaged
 444 trees in southwest Oregon. Forest Research Lab, Research Contribution 41.

445 Hann, D.W., D.D. Marshall, and M.L. Hanus. 2003. Equations for predicting height-to-crown-base,
 446 5-year diameter-growth rate, 5-year height-growth rate, 5-year mortality rate, and maximum
 447 size-density trajectory for Douglas-fir and western hemlock in the coastal region of the Pacific
 448 northwest. Forest Research Lab, Research Contribution 40.

449 Holdaway, M.R. 1984. Modelling the effect of competition on tree diameter growth as applied in
 450 stems. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-GTR-94.

451 Johnson, N.L., and S. Kotz. 1995. *Continuous univariate distributions*. New York, Wiley.

452 Keyser, C.E. 2014. Pacific Northwest Coast (PN) variant overview. USDA For. Serv. Int. Rep.

453 Krajicek, J., K. Brinkman, and S. Gingrich. 1961. Crown competition-a measure of density. *Forest*
 454 *Science* 7(1) :35–42.

455 Krutchkoff, R.G. 1972. Empirical Bayes estimation. *American Statistician* 26(5):14-16.

456 Maetzke, F., and S. Nocentini. 1994. Dominant-height growth and site index curves for Douglas fir.
 457 *Italia Forestale e Montana* 49:582–594.

458 McArdle, R.E., W.H. Meyer, and D. Bruce. 1949. The yield of Douglas-fir in the Pacific Northwest.
 459 USDA For. Serv. Tech. Bull. 201.

460 Mitchell, K.J. 1975. Dynamics and simulated yield of Douglas-fir. *Forest Science Monograph* 17:1-
 461 39.

- 462 Monserud, R.A, and H. Sterba. 1996. A basal area increment model for individual trees growing in
463 even- and uneven-aged forest stands in Austria. *Forest Ecology and Management* 80:57–80.
- 464 Monty, A., P. Lejeune, and J. Rondeux. 2008. Individual distance-independent girth increment
465 model for Douglas-fir in southern Belgium. *Ecological Modelling* 212(3-4):472–479.
- 466 Newnham, R.M., and J. H. G. Smith. 1964. Development and testing of stand models for douglas fir
467 and lodgepole pine. *The Forestry Chronicle* 40:494-504.
- 468 Nocentini, S. 2010. Le specie forestali esotiche: la sperimentazione di Aldo Pavari e le prospettive
469 attuali. *Italia Forestale e Montana* 65(4):449–457.
- 470 Ottorini, J. 1991. Growth and development of individual Douglas-fir in stands for applications to
471 simulate silviculture. *Annals of Forest Science* 48(6):651–666.
- 472 Paine, D.P, and D.W. Hann. 1982. Maximum crown-width equations for Southwestern Oregon tree
473 species. Oregon State University, Forest Research Lab, Research Contribution 46.
- 474 Pavari, A. 1916. Studio preliminare sulle colture di specie forestali esotiche in Italia. *Annali del*
475 *Regio Istituto Superiore Forestale Nazionale* 1:159-379.
- 476 Pavari, A. 1958. La Douglasia verde in Italia. *Monti e Boschi* 9:42–58.
- 477 Pavari, A., and A. De Philippis. 1941. *La sperimentazione di specie forestali esotiche in Italia.*
478 *Risultati del primo ventennio*. Roma, Failli.
- 479 Pretzsch, H. 2009. *Forest dynamics, growth and yield*. Berlin, Springer.
- 480 Pretzsch, H., and P. Biber,. 2005. A re-evaluation of Reineke’s rule and stand density index. *Forest*
481 *Science* 51(4):304–320.
- 482 Pucci, A. 1882. *Le conifere di Moncioni*. Firenze, Ricci.
- 483 Radtke, P.J., N.D. Herring, D.L. Loftis, and C.E. Keyser. 2012. Evaluating Forest Vegetation
484 Simulator predictions for southern Appalachian upland hardwoods with a modified mortality
485 model. *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry* 36(2):61-70.
- 486 Regional Forest Inventory of Tuscany. 1998. *L’inventario forestale*. Firenze, Regione Toscana.

487 Rehman, S. 1999. Empirical model development and comparison with existing correlations. *Applied*
488 *Energy* 64:369–378.

489 Reineke, L.H. 1933. Perfecting a stand-density index for even-aged forests. *Journal of Agricultural*
490 *Research* 46(7):627–638.

491 Ritchie, M.W., and D.W. Hann. 1985. Equations for predicting basal area increment in Douglas-fir
492 and grand fir. Oregon State University, Forest Research Lab, Research Contribution 4.

493 Ruiz Diaz Britez, M., A.S. Sergent, A. Martinez Meier, N. Bréda, and P. Rozenberg. 2014. Wood
494 density proxies of adaptive traits linked with resistance to drought in Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga*
495 *menziesii* (Mirb.) Franco). *Trees* 28(5):1289-1304.

496 Russell, M.B., A.R. Weiskittel, and J.A. Kershaw. 2013. Benchmarking and calibration of Forest
497 Vegetation Simulator individual tree attribute predictions across the northeastern United
498 States. *Northern Journal of Applied Forestry* 30(2):75-84.

499 Russell, M.B., A.W. D'Amato, M.A. Albers, C.W. Woodall, K.J. Puettmann, M.R. Saunders, and
500 C.L. VanderSchaaf. 2015. Performance of the Forest Vegetation Simulator in managed white
501 spruce plantations influenced by eastern spruce budworm in northern Minnesota. *Forest*
502 *Science* 61(4):723-730.

503 Schmid, M., M. Pautasso, and O. Holdenrieder. 2014. Ecological consequences of Douglas fir
504 (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) cultivation in Europe. *European Journal of Forest Research*
505 133(1):13–29.

506 Sergent, A.S., N. Bréda, L. Sanchez, J.C. Bastein, and P. Rozenberg. 2014a. Coastal and interior
507 Douglas-fir provenances differ in growth performance and response to drought episodes at
508 adult age. *Annals of Forest Science* 71(6) :709-720.

509 Sergent, A.S., P. Rozenberg, and N. Bréda. 2014b. Douglas-fir is vulnerable to exceptional and
510 recurrent drought episodes and recovers less well on less fertile sites. *Annals of Forest Science*
511 71(6):697-708.

512 Shaw J.D., G. Vacchiano, R.J. DeRose, A. Brough, A. Kusbach, and J.N. Long. 2006. Local
 513 calibration of the Forest Vegetation Simulator (FVS) using custom inventory data. In
 514 *Proceedings of the 2006 Society of American Foresters National Convention, Pittsburgh PA,*
 515 *October 25-29, 2006.* Society of American Foresters, Bethesda, MD.

516 Shaw, J.D. 2006. Reineke's Stand Density Index: where are we and where do we go from here? In
 517 *Proceedings of the Society of American Foresters 2005 National Convention, October 19-23*
 518 *2005, Ft. Worth, TX.*

519 Siipilehto, J., S. Sarkkola, and L. Mehtatalo. 2007. Comparing regression estimation techniques
 520 when predicting diameter distributions of Scots pine on drained peatlands. *Silva Fennica*
 521 41:333–349.

522 Stage, A. 1973. Prognosis model for stand development. USDA For Serv. Res. Pap. INT-137.

523 Stage, A. 1981. Use of self calibration procedures to adjust general regional yield models to local
 524 conditions. P. 365-375 in *Proceedings of the XVII IUFRO World Congress 5.4.01, Sept. 6-17,*
 525 *Niigata, Japan.*

526 Vacchiano G., J.D. Shaw, R.J. DeRose and J.N. Long. 2008. Inventory-based sensitivity analysis of
 527 the large tree diameter growth submodel of the Southern Variant of FVS. P. 149-169 in
 528 *Proceedings of the Third Forest Vegetation Simulator Conference; Fort Collins, February 13–*
 529 *15, 2007,* Havis R.N., and N.L. Crookston (eds.). USDA Forest Service, Fort Collins, CO.

530 Vacchiano, G., E. Lingua, and R. Motta. 2005. Valutazione dello Stand Density Index in
 531 popolamenti di abete bianco (*Abies alba* Mill.) nel Piemonte meridionale. *Italia Forestale e*
 532 *Montana* 60(3):269–286.

533 Vacchiano, G., R. Motta, G. Bovio, and D. Ascoli. 2014. Calibrating and testing the forest
 534 vegetation simulator to simulate tree encroachment and control measures for heathland
 535 restoration in Southern Europe. *Forest Science* 60(2):241-252.

536 Van Dyck, M.G., and E.E. Smith-Mateja. 2000. Keyword reference guide for the Forest Vegetation
 537 Simulator. USDA For. Serv. Int. Rep.

538 Vanclay, J. K. 1994. *Modelling forest growth and yield: applications to mixed tropical forests*.
 539 Wallingford, CABI.
 540 Wensel, L.C., W.J. Meerschaert, and G.S. Biging. 1987. Tree height and diameter growth models
 541 for Northern California conifers. *Hilgardia* 55(8):1-18.
 542 Wimberly, M.C., and B.B. Bare. 1996. Distance-dependent and distance-independent models of
 543 douglas-fir and western hemlock basal area growth following silvicultural treatment. *Forest*
 544 *Ecology and Management* 89(1-3):1-11.
 545 Wykoff, R.W., N.L Crookston, and A.R. Stage. 1982. User 's guide to the Stand Prognosis Model.
 546 USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-GTR-122.
 547 Wykoff, W.R. 1986. Supplement to the User's Guide for the Stand Prognosis Model — Version
 548 5.0. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-GTR-208.
 549 Wykoff, W.R. 1990. A basal area increment model for individual conifers in the northern Rocky
 550 Mountains. *Forest Science* 36(4):1077-1104.
 551 Yoda, K., T. Kira, H. Ogawa, and K. Hozumi. 1963. Intraspecific competition among higher plants.
 552 XI. Self-thinning in overcrowded pure stands under cultivated and natural conditions. *Journal*
 553 *of the Institute of Polytechnics of the Osaka City University* 14:107-129.
 554
 555

556 Table captions

557

558 Table 1: Main climatic and geographic parameters of the sampled stands: MAT=mean annual
559 temperature, MWMT=mean warmest month temperature, MCMT=mean coldest month
560 temperature, MAP=mean annual precipitation, MSP=mean summer precipitation, EU=
561 ecopedological units.

562 Table 2: Main site and dendrometric characteristics of the study areas: SDI=stand density index,
563 CCF=crown competition factor, PCC=percent of canopy cover, QMD=quadratic mean diameter,
564 TH=top height, SI=site index.

565 Table 3: Confidence intervals of $HT - CW - CR - \ln(DDS)$ submodel parameters (bold: default PN-
566 FVS value within 95% c.i. of the uncalibrated submodel).

567 Table 4: Scale factors computed by self-calibration of the $\ln(DDS)$ submodel.

568 Table 5: Results of calibrated PN-FVS model validation at Mercurella and Vallombrosa sites.

569

570

571

572

573 Table 1

574

Stand	Latitude	Longitude	Elevation	MAT	MWMT	MCMT	MAP	MSP	EU
	degrees		m asl		°C		mm		code
acquerino44	44.009	11.002	950	9.5	19.2	0.9	1485	463	8.07
acquerino58	44.005	11.009	900	9.8	19.5	1.2	1458	455	8.07
amiata	42.872	11.581	1100	10	19.7	2	622	246	16.01
berceto	44.498	9.978	950	9	18.9	-0.2	1301	444	8.08
camaldoli152	43.807	11.812	1030	9.3	18.9	0.9	1148	394	8.07
camaldoli209	43.805	11.819	1020	9.3	18.9	0.9	1142	393	8.07
campalbo	44.129	11.301	950	9.1	18.9	0.2	1365	415	10.01
campamoli	43.836	11.75	920	9.8	19.4	1.2	1134	390	10.04
cavallaro	43.959	11.748	880	9.8	19.7	0.8	986	362	10.03
cottede	44.105	11.175	1100	8.4	18.3	-0.6	1268	392	10.01
frugnolo	43.395	11.916	770	11	20.6	2.5	734	275	10.04
gemelli	43.968	11.728	1000	9.2	18.9	0.4	1211	424	10.03
lagdei	44.415	10.018	1250	7.5	17	-1	1780	578	8.07
lama	43.838	11.869	860	10.2	19.9	1.6	1103	384	8.07
lizzano	44.155	10.831	1120	8.5	18.1	0	1128	428	8.07
montelungo	44.024	10.962	1090	8.8	18.4	0.2	1464	456	8.07
orecchiella	44.206	10.364	1260	7.7	17.2	-0.6	1671	527	8.05
ortodicorso	44.04	10.988	1074	8.8	18.5	0.2	1482	459	8.07
pietracamela	42.515	13.548	1120	9.8	19.4	1	806	319	11.07
porretta	44.135	10.922	1057	8.8	18.5	0.2	1179	407	8.07

575

576

Stand	Age	Aspect	Slope	Trees	SDI	CCF	PCC	QMD	TH	SI
	years	degrees		n	-	-	%	cm	m	m
acquerino44	75	135	30	49	517.5	417	87	53.2	41.1	31.1
acquerino58	85	180	60	31	578.9	499	76	75.9	47.4	31.1
amiata	75	225	10	34	512.1	428	53	66.5	46.8	34.1
berceto	82	355	50	44	488.6	420	69	54.9	35.8	28
camaldoli152	75	90	30	53	553.1	442	52	52.9	45.7	31.1
camaldoli209	75	135	30	39	550.5	456	41	63.8	48.9	34.1
campalbo	79	90	10	24	434.2	373	41	74.4	47.0	31.1
campamoli	72	270	40	36	457.4	375	64	59.8	49.2	36.9
cavallaro	80	45	55	35	485.7	402	64	63.2	47.2	31.1
cottede	87	180	20	37	481.1	405	48	60.6	40.7	28
frugnolo	86	355	20	43	466.4	375	45	54.2	46.5	31.1
gemelli	81	135	30	32	472.3	394	62	65.6	47.6	31.1
lagdei	87	357	10	35	509.7	425	72	65.1	40.2	28
lama	73	90	60	31	375.0	315	56	57.9	43.3	31.1
lizzano	80	90	30	39	568.8	474	78	65.1	48.0	34.1
montelungo	75	135	45	38	475.0	389	62	59.2	42.4	31.1
orecchiella	72	225	15	36	447.4	368	33	59	42.0	31.1
ortodicorso	80	45	40	34	411.5	335	66	58	42.6	28
pietracamela	80	315	85	21	783.5	619	76	49.2	43.1	28
porretta	85	40	25	46	556.0	453	58	57.9	40.6	28

Submodel	Statistical parameters	Confidence interval		PN-FVS default
		2.5%	97.5%	
HT	p2	177.051041	244.5944047	407.1595
	p3	5.439085	16.9760288	7.2885
	p4	-1.274372	-0.6851091	-0.5908
CW	a1	3.59114045	23.884341979	5.884
	a2	0.80599868	1.311925335	0.544
	a3	-0.74220643	-0.308624119	-0.207
	a4	-0.02696175	0.142872953	0.204
	a5	-0.0869313	0.156519271	-0.006
	a6	-0.01535613	-0.003457285	-0.004
CR	A	20.029	41.385	0
	B	10.162	26.481	4.5
	C	-0.105	1.092	0.311
ln(DDS)	b1	95.403020	513.117783	-0.1992
	b2	0.248486	2.749077	-0.009845
	b3	-0.040339	-0.002925	0
	b4	7.360673	17.855091	0.495162
	b5	0.097451	3.735880	0.003263
	b6	-1.197667	1.942963	0.014165
	b7	-13.818310	7.291880	-0.340401
	b8	-14.522460	14.427475	0
	b9	2.005133	24.924225	0.802905
	b10	-10.721810	20.635366	1.936912
	b11	-25.792430	16.887971	0
	b12	-0.007620	0.007434	-0.0000641
	b13	-0.037989	0.302196	-0.001827
	b14	0.034499	0.126296	0
	b15	0.220498	9.916505	0
	b16	-125.8779	-42.562184	-0.129474
	b17	-0.100059	0.006533	-0.001689
	b18	-0.002082	0.229584	0

Stand	Number of tree records	Fvs scale factor	Ratio std. Error	Bayes weight	Scale factor
acquerino44	7	1.019	3.642	0.451	1.043
acquerino58	9	1.555	2.663	0.85	1.681
amiata	8	2.869	1.543	0.999	2.872
berceto	9	1.988	3.549	0.947	2.066
camaldoli152	9	2.14	2.509	0.975	2.182
camaldoli209	8	2.447	1.56	0.995	2.458
campalbo	6	2.42	1.076	0.995	2.431
campamoli	10	3.388	2.029	1	3.388
cavallaro	6	1.882	3.061	0.924	1.982
cottede	8	3.181	1.288	1	3.181
frugnolo	8	1.656	2.143	0.896	1.756
gemelli	6	1.847	3.576	0.907	1.967
lagdei	7	1.072	2.333	0.579	1.128
lama	10	5.19	1.589	1	5.19
lizzano	9	3.299	2.5	1	3.299
montelungo	9	2.952	2.105	0.999	2.955
orecchiella	10	2.371	2.565	0.99	2.392
ortodicorso	9	2.372	1.992	0.991	2.391
pietracamela	9	2.282	2.151	0.987	2.307
porretta	13	1.363	3.241	0.759	1.504

584 Table 5

Statistical parameter	Mercurella		Vallombrosa	
	DBH	Height	DBH	Height
R ²	0.89	0.54	0.96	0.72
MBE	-4.36 cm	3.17 m	0.03 cm	-5.32 m
RMSE	6.15 cm	4.44 m	3.67 cm	7.07 m
MPE	-6.76%	8.85%	1.55%	-10.13%
MABE	4.79 cm	3.53 m	3.32 cm	6.31 m

585

586

587

588 Figure captions

589

590 Figure 1 – Location of the study areas

591 Figure 2 - Observed versus predicted tree heights by default PN-FVS Height-Diameter submodel

592 Figure 3 - Basal area predicted by PN-FVS default, by calibrated PN-FVS and by Cantiani yield

593 table (1965)

594 Figure 4 - Volume predicted by PN-FVS default, by calibrated PN-FVS and by Cantiani yield table

595 Figure 5 - Simulation of the response of stand basal area (above) and volume (below) to thinning

596 from below in the Campamoli (left) and Acquerino58 (right) stands.

597

598

599

600









